

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME II

MAY 1907

NUMBER 7

Editorial

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

Two hundred members of the Association attended the meeting at Chicago on March 29-30. A majority of these came from the states nearest Chicago, but there were also many delegates from the South. The meeting was in every respect a success. The papers read were interesting and suggestive, and once more demonstrated the wisdom of the plan of making up the programme by special invitation. This was the recommendation of the first programme committee and that it will remain the settled policy of the Association may now be assumed. For the next programme two new features have been suggested which seem to us to carry with them decided advantages. The first of these is that the printed programme shall contain not only the title of each paper and the name of its author, but also a brief statement of the thesis or argument that is to be presented; the second recommendation is that the programme committee shall appoint one or two members of the Association to lead the discussion of each paper. These two provisions will strengthen our meetings at their weakest point. In the three meetings that we have held there has been, except in a comparatively small number of cases, little or no discussion. The proposed arrangement entails a cutting-down of the number of papers, and that too seems to us desirable.

Summaries of the papers read will be printed in the next number of the *Journal*. The programme as a whole was reasonably representative of the various aspects of classical study, with the notable exception, however, of ancient history. The proportion of papers of a purely literary type was not as large as it might have been, but the soundness of the quality made up for the defect in quantity, and

Professor Slaughter's essay demonstrated effectively that even so oft-treated a theme as Horace's style was still open to new points of view. Principal Peterson also, in his address on "The Classics and Modern Life," made a plea for a more liberal study of Greek literature. Commenting on the changed conditions under which the study of the classics must be carried on at the present time, he pointed out the necessity of reducing the amount of time devoted to the details of Greek grammar and composition, and of directing the attention of students to the content of the literature. Dr. Peterson was not in favor of mitigating the severity of the instruction in Latin grammar, but in some of the pedagogical papers a tendency along these lines was manifest. More than one speaker seemed inclined to forego at least a part of the discipline in Latin syntax in order to make room for a systematic study of the various topics that occur in the texts read in the schools.

While the meeting lacked the splendor of a Shaw banquet, the two luncheons provided by the University of Chicago, and the reception and smoker on Friday evening, gave the members an opportunity of renewing old acquaintance. That the Association is doing the work expected of it in bringing its members in touch with one another was apparent. Everyone seemed to know everyone else, and the meeting was more like a reunion of friends than an assembly of delegates. Every year will add to the attractiveness of this side of the organization.

The Secretary-Treasurer's report showed that the finances of the Association are in a highly satisfactory condition. The list of members in good standing now contains 1,050 names. The prospects in the different states, as described by the Vice-Presidents who attended the meeting, indicate the probability of a substantial increase during the current year. Classical teachers everywhere are awaking to the professional and personal advantages of membership in the Association. The officers elected were: President, Professor Edward Capps, University of Chicago; First Vice-President, Professor Walter Denison, University of Michigan; Secretary-Treasurer, Professor B. L. D'Ooge, Michigan State Normal College, Ypsilanti; member of the Executive Committee, Professor J. W. Hullihen, Grant University, Chattanooga, Tenn. The next annual meeting is to be held in Nashville, Tenn., in April, 1908.

THE DIDO EPISODE AS A TRAGEDY

BY NORMAN W. DEWITT
Washington University

The strongest impression made by the fourth book is due to the character of Dido, and this alone takes us to tragedy. The epic is essentially the man's poem, to record his bravery, his travels, and his misfortunes. There is no room there for female characters, unless they be Amazons or passive women like Penelope or Andromache. Beautiful these women are, but it must be borne in mind that they do nothing, serving chiefly to furnish a background against which the horrors of war seem yet more horrible. But tragedy is the soul's epic, and for the struggles of the spirit, for hatred and revenge, for heroic sacrifice and fearless defiance of wrong, woman is as strong as man, or even stronger. Hence it is tragedy that gives us the great names of women in ancient literature—Antigone and Alcestis, Clytemnestra, Electra, Phaedra, and Medea. An older tragedy like the *Agamemnon* might be called by the name of the king, but this does not conceal for a moment the superior power of the queen to engage and exercise our feelings. Euripides had a clearer vision, and named his tragedy for Medea and not for Jason. It is only among these heroines of tragedy that Dido can find meet company. She is not a child like Ariadne, not a Europa nor a Pasiphaë. She is an ill-starred queen. *Injelix Dido.*

Homer may nod, but the tragedian never; he seizes our attention for once and all, holding it on the strain until the piece is done. The action must move fast, and hope and fear, love and hate, must take their way in rapid course. Dido acts. She usurps our interest. It is her story from the moment that we hear of the crime which shattered her happiness. She founded a city. She defied her enemies and despised her suitors. From the first meeting with Aeneas she determined his action. The banquet followed soon. Once her scruples were overcome—and the struggle was short—she set about the wooing. She led the hero about the city and showed

him her walls that were well begun. She renewed the banquet. She planned the hunt. She took his sword and gave him a Tyrian sword in its place. Last of all she dressed him up in Tyrian fashion and set him to superintending her walls. Her capacity for suffering was equal to her capacity for deciding and for acting. At one flash she divined the movements of Aeneas and burst into violent reproach, which turned to entreaty and again to wild denunciation. She subdued her pride for love and sent pitiful petitions to the ships. She planned calmly her tragic end, and carried it out as she had planned. She had the power to feel and the power to suffer, and her energy was irresistible.

On the tragic stage tread none but princes, and Dido is a queen of the line of Belus and Agenor. Her father was a king, and her brother received the crown of Tyre. By birth they were of that same house to which belonged the great and unhappy women of the family of Minos of Crete. The story ran that Jupiter loved Europa and carried her away. She became the mother of Minos, who married Pasiphaë, and she became the mother of Ariadne and of the famous Phaedra. To the same line by marriage belonged Aeetes, father of Medea and brother of Circe. Of the house of Belus and Agenor were also the unhappy Danaids; and so Dido is inferior in birth to no heroine of tragedy. Virgil has deliberately broken with tradition in order to make her the equal in rank of those whose names alone were considered worthy of a place in the most serious forms of literature.

As the hero of tragedy must be a prince, so the scene is regularly laid in a palace. It is so in the Dido story. After the meeting in the temple Aeneas returned no more to the ships until after the parting scene. In the palace was the banquet, and from there they set out to view the city on the following morning. There the banquet was renewed. Before the doors, as if upon the stage, gathered the brilliant cavalcade on the morning of the hunt. Tragedy loves spectacles, and this is superb. The brilliant company is waiting, and the impatient horse, glorious in purple and gold, champs his foaming bit. At last the doors are opened, and Dido moves forward surrounded with all her retinue:

Tandem progreditur magna stipante caterva,
Sidoniam picto chlamydem circumdata limbo:
cui pharetra ex auro, crines nodantur in aurum,
aurea purpuream subnectit fibula vestem.

This whole passage glitters with color. Gold is mentioned three times in two lines and four times in fourteen. The whole description is pictorial and highly spectacular. As this pageant was enacted before the palace doors, so it was there the stormy parting scene took place; and this might be acted on the stage without alteration. Within the doors the prostrate queen was carried by the servants. From her tower she watched the ships of the departing Trojans, and behind those walls she died like Phaedra.

The treatment of time is scarcely less dramatic than the unity of place. In Homer it will be remembered that sunrise and sunset are events in the narrative. Homer usually allows both his hearers and himself to sleep at night. In tragedy there is no time for night. If events could not have happened in twenty-four hours, the fact is ignored. Time is of no consequence. It is almost eliminated. During a choric song days may pass, as in the *Agamemnon*. It is so in the fourth book of the *Aeneid*. After the day of the hunt there is no more count of time. It is a poetic injustice to attempt a time-analysis. The Fama interlude serves, like the opening chorus of the *Agamemnon*, to divert our attention and to create the impression that much time has elapsed. Night is often mentioned, but not as the sequel of the day. It is for the sake of the sympathy of the hour with the event. It was night when strange voices sounded from the tomb of Sychaeus and the weird owl prolonged her wailing note. It was night when all nature was at rest, but the storm raged in Dido's heart. Morning was the time for sailing and the most awful hour for the death. The treatment of time is in this book a matter of taste, in so far as morning and night are chosen. In so far as the succession of day and night is ignored, it is dramatic.

The truth is that in the fourth book there are several passages that are really lyric in nature, and among these are those descriptive of night. This is a tragic feature. The tragic poet, it is true, is not allowed to express his feelings in his own person, but he has the

chorus to speak for him. From none but a chorus would come so well the words:

Heu vatum ignarae mentes! quid vota furentem,
quid delubra iuvant? (iv. 65, 66)

These are the reflections of experience grown wise in the knowledge of human nature. They are the spectator's or the poet's observation. When we come to the description of the marriage, we have something more than mere epic. This is a lyric touch. The real meaning of the words lies unexpressed.

prima et tellus et pronuba Iuno
dant signum: fulsere ignes et conscius aether
conubiis, summoque ulularunt vertice nymphae. (166 ff.)

Tragedy has closer kinship with the lyric than has the epic, and on these grounds we explain lyric passages in the fourth book. The beautiful lines beginning,

Nox erat, et placidum carpebant fessa soporem (522 ff.)

are a wonderful piece of art too delicate for the epic. In the compass of half a dozen lines are contained almost every word in the language denoting rest and quiet or weariness: *nox, placidum soporem, fessa, quierant, tacet, somno positae sub nocte silenti*. Then follows an antistrophe depicting the storm in Dido's heart:

saevit amor, magnoque irarum fluctuat aestu.

The lyric character of this picture is signally shown by its similarity to a fragment of Alcman (65 in Hiller-Crusius). The closing lines of the fourth book are like a final utterance of the chorus. At least we find in them the reflections of the poet upon Dido's life. She died not in fate's appointed way, nor by a death she merited, but unhappy, and fired with a sudden madness.

It has been said already that the parting scene could be put upon the stage without alteration. It is also to be pointed out that it is in the form of a debate like that which is found in Euripides' *Medea*. There are in the speech of Aeneas distinctly rhetorical elements, and it is on technical grounds that he creeps out of blame. He had never consented to their marriage nor entered into a treaty, and he weakly denies the exercise of personal choice. It is further to be observed that there are present in this scene only two persons and the servants,

just as in the drama of Aeschylus. The same is true of the colloquy between Dido and her sister at the beginning of the fourth book. Moreover, the sister of the heroine, like the nurse who appears near the last, is a stock character of tragedy. One will recall Ismene in Sophocles' *Antigone* and the nurse of Phaedra in the *Hippolytus* of Euripides. The messages carried by Anna from the palace to the ships will recall the messenger of the stage, and the boy Ascanius with the ill-omened mantle of Helen may suggest to some the children of Medea sent with the robe to Jason's bride. Suicide was well known in tragedy. So died Ajax, Dejanira, and Phaedra. Dido's death, as custom demanded, was within the palace and not before it.

Mr. Nettleship has pointed out tragic irony in the fourth book. Dido and Anna sacrifice to Phoebus, Ceres, and Lyaeus—the gods that preside over the foundation of cities and the arts of peace; but she was soon to forget her city and to leave unquenchable enmity to her posterity. Perhaps the irony of the banquet scene is even greater. She invokes Jupiter, the god of guests, and by her guest she was to fall. She calls upon Bacchus, the giver of joy, but her happiness was so soon to pass away. She prays for kindly Juno to be near, and Juno proved the unkindest of all to her. Last of all, she prays that the day may be a joyous one to the Tyrians and to them who have come from Troy, while the fourth book ends with a curse and a legacy of hatred. The whole banquet scene seems to be a mocking premonition of the future. It is almost clause by clause the antithesis of the conclusion of the fourth book. All turned out other than she prayed and hoped. It is the *peripeteia* or irony of fate.

Tragedy loves dark and ambiguous sayings. It may be that we are pressing the point a little too hard, but one can hardly fail to feel the double meaning in the words:

Iuppiter, hospitibus nam te dare iura locuntur,
hunc laetum Tyriisque diem Troiaque profectis
esse velis, *nostrosque huius meminisse minores.* (i. 731 ff.)

Surely they would remember that day. There is another line that is perhaps occasionally misunderstood because it is not recognized as deliberately ambiguous.

Extremam hanc oro veniam (*miserere sororis*),
quam mihi cum dederit, *cumulatam morte remittam.* (iv. 435, 436)

This is clearly intended to convey one meaning to the reader and another to Anna. Tragedy abounds in this gloomy innuendo.

Perhaps, after all, these tragic features that have been observed may all be traced to the plot. This, as Aristotle says, is the soul of tragedy, and Dido's life is essentially tragic. Passionate, impetuous, and powerful, she was capable only of great things, great success or awful disaster. Royal birth and talent raised her up to an eminence from which fate should cast her down. She was not guiltless, yet she did not wholly deserve her fate. It was inevitable from her nature. She had set before herself an ideal of life as pure and loveless as Daphne's, while she was capable of a passion as irresistible as Medea's. After her cold lover's departure she was too intensely proud to live. Death was the only escape from self-torment.

Thus plot and character are so essentially tragic that there was no other way in which to treat the story. Tragic suggestions come unbidden. Tragic gloom and tragic irony need not be sought; they are inevitable. The action of the story is not in space; it works itself out in Dido's heart, and so the scene is constantly in the palace. Her suffering knows no cessation by night nor by day; hence there is no count of time. Yet the smaller features that have been mentioned help the dramatic associations; these are the sister and the nurse, stock characters of the stage; the messages carried from the palace to the ships, the ominous gifts carried by Ascanius, and the spectacular pageant enacted before the palace on the morning of that fatal day which was the cause of all her sorrows.

BALANCE IN THE TEACHING OF SECONDARY LATIN

BY F. C. EASTMAN

State Normal School, Cedar Falls, Ia.

Probably no subject in the secondary curriculum demands a more careful exercise of judgment on the part of a teacher than that of Latin. A point that demands the most constant and scrupulous attention is the right balance between the pupil's analytical understanding of the subject, on the one hand, and the sensitive appreciation of it, on the other—between the "rule" and real subjective *appropriation*.

I have in mind two students of pretty nearly equal capability who have finished the high-school course in Latin under teachers who are considered good. These pupils represent types readily recognizable. The horizon of the one is limited; it is something of an effort for him to see beyond the minimum amount of text compassed. He does not readily unite events. His independent grasp of the whole is feeble. On the other hand, his scrutiny of details is microscopic. His insistent hold on them until they are worked out is constrictive. He comes to the sentence, *Si id ita fecisset, sibi populoque Romano perpetuam gratiam atque amicitiam cum eo futuram*. He can show accurately, by diagram, if need be, the relation of every word in this sentence to every other word affected by it. He understands the reason for every case and mood. Every form is labeled and pigeon-holed. He knows what kind of a condition *fecisset* represents; just what it was in the direct discourse form, and by what process it came to have a form different from the typical one given in the grammar. He can scan any number of lines of the *Aeneid*, noting the caesura and placing the ictus with exactness. He can account for every vowel-quantity that is referable to rule, and quote authority on hidden quantity—but he can't read Latin. The *feeling* for the subject, the large binding-together of the items, is wanting. There is no question about his accuracy, nor about the

accuracy of his teacher; but somehow Latin has not done for him what it should.

He has been benefited. His faculties have been trained in a logical sense. But he has been doing his Latin work at an immense cost of time and effort. The permanent value of his Latin when studied thus is undoubtedly great; but in view of crowded courses and the increasing claims of so-called "practical" studies, it is not an unnatural question whether this Latin has done enough more for him than the other disciplinary studies to warrant the outlay of time and energy during four years. The reason for the retention of Latin in the schools does rest upon, and must rest upon, a higher claim than this.

The training of the other student has been rather in the opposite direction. He has been brought early to a seizure of the author's meaning in its fulness. He has been trained to look over large Latin landscapes. He connects chapters and paragraphs more readily than words. His reading is somewhat on the principle of the suspension bridge. The obvious points of the narrative are what he grapples to. He swings into the sentence and finds his rest on the opposite pier. He reads it chiefly in the light of what precedes and what he catches with the forward glance. He translates breezily: "If he did this, etc." The indefiniteness of the English conditional sentence is one of the sources of his temporary salvation and personal joy. "If he did this" is quite intelligible in a general way, and is fairly satisfactory. In the light of current usage and of the context, it may be relatively future; as to form it may be past; and this, for him, satisfies the demands of *fecisset*. While our first student has been locating the one word as to its connections and meaning and complete mood content, the second has swung on and off, and far away is engaged with the wars of other Gauls. But as to a conception of the full import of the mood form, or the possibility of turning back into correct Latin a good English translation of the sentence, he is utterly hopeless. He has traversed large areas of text, and has gained in a general way an idea of the author's meaning—enough, at least, to sustain interest well—and to feel something of his mood. He catches some of the spirit of Cicero and works with not a little enthusiasm. Incidentally he has spanned the amount,

or more than the amount, prescribed by the Committee of Ten. He reads Vergil with some appreciation of the poetic feeling, and may have finished the twelve books. He may have a fair conception of the integrity of the whole epic. He has been far enough to get a faint breath of the airs of the promised land and to feel that it is good to be there. But in his whole training he has been impatient of exactness and of details. Constructions were fetters to his spirit. Analyses were impediments.

This course of training has likewise its advantages for the student. It has strengthened him in readiness, in quickness of perception, in the grasping of things in their largeness and completeness. But for training him in analysis, in close and logical thinking, in accuracy, in the power of observation, it may have been considerably worse than useless.

Again, in this case, it may be fairly questioned whether (granting that no actual harm has resulted from the looseness of the work) these benefits enumerated will in themselves repay the expenditure of time and energy involved; or whether equivalent benefits may not accrue from the study of an English translation, if accompanied by work in history and antiquities. That such questions do arise there can be no doubt. It may easily be supposed that these questions, in the main, are the results of an inclination in teaching to the one or the other of the two extremes.

The fact that most students incline, in however slight a degree, to one of these extremes leads to the belief that both tendencies are important factors in Latin teaching. In point of fact, the extreme results of these two tendencies represent two obvious and seemingly opposite aspects in secondary Latin education, which, when properly united, stand for a single principle in the teaching of the subject. Both need careful consideration from the earliest days of the work. There is vital need that they be made to unite, and the keynote throughout the secondary Latin course is the rational combination between the close logical understanding, on the one hand, and the sensitive appreciation, coupled with the larger view, on the other. Brought to common terms, the first must be not only accurate, but *vitalized*; the second must be not only comprehensive, but *regulated*.

Now, the one process involves the consideration of the paradigm

and the rule, and demands that the learner work in accordance with them, being consciously governed by them; the other has in view the working in exact accordance with the paradigm and the rule *without* being consciously governed by them. The first process, by sure degrees, should merge into the second.

If this is true, there is no safety in any method that contemplates the avoidance of the paradigm and the rule. When a language is learned subjectively, for conversational purposes, as German or French may be learned, by contact with and imitation of German and French speech where it is heard constantly on every hand, there may be no actual need of the rule consciously applied, or even definitely understood. A child with undeveloped logical faculties may catch French speech from a governess, and speak it with far greater fluency than the college-taught scholar who may have studied its literature for years, but there is little value attaching to the process beyond the fact of possession. The small child who has seen no English grammar knows English empirically, but the acquisition of it has cost no mental effort. But formal English grammar and Latin grammar, which is necessarily formal, must be taught objectively, and there can be no evasion of the rule and the paradigm.

Latin if accurately learned (and if not accurately learned it has little use in our courses), employs all the logical faculties from the beginning—observation, judgment, reasoning, analogy. The powers of perception are put in constant training in the observation of form: the final *-o* of the dative and ablative, the *-ba-* of the imperfect, the *-issimus* of the superlative. The judgment is constantly trained through the association of form with function. The separative force, the sociative force, the volitive force, the final force, are associated with their respective forms. Lastly the results of the judgments are gathered together in the true syllogism exactly as in a science. The rule in Latin is the major premise of a deductive syllogism. It is the necessary and convenient test of the given case. Or, from an inductive standpoint, how do we know the truth of the major premise? The scientist has noted that this, that, and the other cloven-footed animal is herbivorous, and, finding that in the many known instances it is true he argues with considerable certainty to the unknown cases, and says *all*, but always with the reservation,

probably. Likewise the grammarian roving the fields of Latin literature notes that in the many known cases *utinam* with the subjunctive denotes a wish, and so reasons to the universal—to the rule—the major premise.

But pure induction for the learner in Latin is out of the question. The rule cannot be properly formulated from the fragmentary items of the learner's experience. He must be assured by the dicta of those who have gone over the ground before. It is doubtful if any modern advocate of the inductive method has ever recommended the carrying of the principle to its limit in elementary Latin instruction. But it is not so many years ago—less than twenty—that the principle did come to be largely misunderstood. Latin instruction was caught in the larger movement in literature, society, and education, nature-ward, science-ward. The extreme inductive system was the outlet for the impulse to get to nature with Latin teaching. The Latin *paedagogus* carried it in his ecstasy far beyond its intended limits. It seemed to him that the old deductive method represented everything that was artificial and unproductive and difficult. The new way was the natural one, fruitful in results, an easy short-cut. For him now, in the acquisition of Latin *erant omnino duo itinera quibus itineribus exire posset. Unum (antiquum), angustum et difficile, vix qua singuli carri ducerentur; mons autem altissimus impendebat; alterum (novum) per provinciam nostram, multo facilius et expeditius propterea quod inter fines . . . Rhodanus fluit, isque nonnullis locis vado transitur.* And so they made for the shallow fords of their Rhone, and the places where they crossed it were indeed *nonnullis*.

Seriously, the method was sadly mismanaged and abused. There was a popular impression that it was designed to do away with all *regulae*, and that the pupil was to grow easily, pleasantly, unconsciously into an understanding of the Latin language as into physical stature. Along with it leading Latin educators were insisting, rightly enough when understood, upon getting speedily over large areas of text and upon the instantaneous perception of the bearing of the parts of the sentence. The result was a hurrying and a crowding—a mad stampede over the river Rhone. A misunderstanding of the method is responsible for a considerable body of half-trained students who

went out from the schools. Such a condition was bound to correct itself, and that view of the subject has practically disappeared.

But, having made a plea for the old-time *regula*, I would say with equal insistence that this is only a partial view, only one side of the system. It is a necessary preliminary, but only a preliminary. Side by side with the analytical process should be developed the sympathetic feeling for the subject. This is one of the strongest factors that make for the attainment of the real end of Latin study. It is very easy to overestimate the logical values. There are those to whom this very logical value affords a delight and a living interest; but these are few. These mental gymnastics are good, but they lack the element of feeling; and mental discipline of that nature, while it may be gained from the study of Latin, may be gained as well by algebraic formulae. One of the chief faults of the older teaching has been, not an overestimate of the importance of close analysis and construction, but an attention so centered upon this phase as to make it almost the all-in-all. If we leave out of our account the fact that the Latin page, the Latin sentence, is the reflection of a human mind; that a *word* is connected with a *feeling*; that a grammatical mood corresponds to a mental mood; that Vergil and Catullus, Cicero and Livy, Tacitus and Juvenal, show the same qualities of pathos and sublimity, and thrill with the same emotions of love and hate that live in the pages of Byron and Tennyson and Kipling and Swinburne, we are leaving out one of the main values of Latin as a factor in education.

It may be worth something in the way of discipline to go through every sentence of *Paradise Lost* for the sake of the grammatical analysis; there may be something of the same importance in studying the tragedies of Shakespeare in search of coincidences and combinations to prove the existence of a hidden cipher; but these works are worth inestimably more to the thousands who have been magnetically attracted by their beauties, and who have gained an uplift of soul, and have been for the time lost to everything but the elevation that has come through the knowledge of a larger psychological world and the revelation of man. If there were nothing else in the study of Caesar than the unraveling of subordinate clauses in the *oratio obliqua*; if we gained nothing more from Vergil than a

knowledge of the way in which the sack of Troy and the flight of Aeneas are told, we might well consider whether it is worth while to retain them. But to bring the student into vital touch with the language, and to such an appropriation of it as to cause him to *feel* through its medium the values of a life rich in so much that underlies our modern life in literature, art, and law; to look upon the cosmopolitan world of the Romans through the glass of Latin letters—this constitutes an education and a culture in the best sense.

This development of a feeling for values may be begun with the first sentences in the beginner's book: a feeling for the force of the *-am* of the accusative as representing the receiving of an action; the nominative form as instantly suggesting that something is or does; the *-bamus* as instantly suggesting a person, a number, and a time. Incessantly, over and over, the function is associated with the form, the paradigm being used to verify, until there is no longer a use for it.

At the close of the first year's work certain definite groups of facts of syntax should be the property of the pupil; and, whatever method may have been employed, these facts should be systematically grouped. The declensions should be associated, as should the conjugations, relative clauses, conditions, etc. This constitutes his equipment for attacking the connected prose of the second year. He soon will find the need of much more than this, but it will do to begin on.

On first survey of the equipment and the task on hand, the task looks confusing. The teacher who is expected to guide the class through four or five books of the *Commentaries*, to give careful attention to Latin reading, to proper translation, to construction, to word-order, to Latin composition, to English derivatives, to antiquities, to literary parallels, to historical allusions, etc., will find need of some sure contrivance for the concentration of efficiency and the expansion of time.

Translation work, in its wider sense, involves three processes: (1) the survey of the sentence in the Latin order—the catching of the bird's-eye view—the reading of it again and again until a meaning dawns; (2) the assurance as to the meaning by a careful consideration of reasons and rules; and (3) the final act, the abandonment of the Latin form of expression and the casting of the thought

into good idiomatic English. As a rule, in our narration of facts we first grapple to the main thought, and then attach to this the accessories. The thing done, or that is being done, or is to be done, we mentally *get done*, and trail after it the means, the reasons, the causes. Not so the Roman. In the normal periodic sentence he presented only one of the main things, the subject, at the outset, representing the doer of some act foreshadowed; then, leaving that subject to be held in mind, he swung out into the causes, the reasons, the purposes, the conditions, the time, the attendant circumstances of that untold act; and at the last, with all the mass of material, everything pertaining to the thought arrayed in order, he wound up strongly with the act itself. Words, phrases, and clauses are held mentally in abeyance, until at last by a key-word their relations are ascertained and they are fixed.

Rudyard Kipling's "Ship That Found Herself" was a combination of individual parts—timbers, planks, bolts, rivets—until the strain in the launching came that compelled each part to its proper office in relation to the others—bolt, timber, plank, and beam being reciprocally adjusted to bear its own part of the strain till the ship was no longer an aggregation of parts, but a unit. So the phrases and clauses in the sentence may be considered as hanging together, capable of various possible combinations for all that we know, until they are keyed together by the final periodic word, and the sentence, the thought, has "found itself."

This process of holding the thought in suspension is the one that should be followed by the pupil in his first reading of the sentence, as well as in all his Latin reading; but the word-by-word idea need not be too rigidly adhered to. That is, he may permit himself to anticipate. Now the writer sees the figure of the thought, so to speak, as a whole. He would, of course, if he could, transfer the thought, not by a word-by-word process, but just as he feels it. He has the end in view from the start. If this is true, it follows that the reader may be expected to anticipate at the earliest possible moment the end that the writer saw. To the writer the other pier on which the timbers were to rest was in view. The reader can certainly most intelligently seize the meaning of the sentence if he can bring the location of that pier into view. There are few people that do

not "read ahead" in English. A swift anticipatory forecast catches up the sentence as a whole and prevents misreading. The practice of holding the thought in abeyance is good; the practice of seizing upon the meaning with the forward glance is not inconsistent with it.

Construction is the rock on which hopes of progress are oftentimes shattered. It is there that judgment is needed. By its neglect a pupil may be encouraged in habits of shiftlessness; by overattention to it he may become classically near-sighted. Here, as in the first-year work, is there need of the principle of a right balance between sensitive appreciation and logical exactness. I suspect that a majority of the average class feel that it is one score for their side if a subjunctive is passed by unnoticed. If the pupil feels that he need not give an account of its value, he is likely to be satisfied more and more with a nebulous view of it. On the other hand, I have known a lesson in its bearings to be lost sight of while for fifteen or twenty minutes a pupil was put through a sweat-box process over a single construction. Nerves were racked, patience was strained, and a hostility for the subject engendered.

The third step is a good translation, and this is the final test of the work. It is the *fructus ante actorum*. Pages might be given to its consideration; there is room only for a suggestion or two.

In the first reading the thought must be cast in the Latin form and the Latin idiom. A word in a Latin sentence often gets its character from the company it keeps. In a page of the Latin lexicon it stands characterless, rigid; a score or more of meanings may be attached. These are just its possibilities, its powers. When it is made a part of a sentence it changes like a chameleon to the color of the thought. *Tandem* has more than one possibility; but see it fit into the indignant color scheme in *Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? Iste* may be translated as a pronoun in the vocabulary, but it gets its local color from the tone, the sneer, the sarcastic curl of the lip. It does not necessarily call for a definite translation at all. *Credo*, "I believe," is a verb, strong, indicative, and frank; but in Cicero's parenthesis it can lurk and crouch and insinuate, and, if there be such a word, can *ironize* the whole thought. It is no longer "I believe," but "I suppose; O, yes!" These are

idioms, and the reader must simply adapt himself to them. So much for the reading and the reader.

But the thought itself must be disengaged, and that wholly, from the Latin idiom when the pupil essays the English translation. He naturally *wants* to keep the Latin cast after his struggle with it. He dislikes to give it up long enough to grapple with the English. "Give a paraphrase of that sentence or that paragraph," will often help in the freeing process. If the idioms or the styles coincide, it is difficult to see what harm there can be in the literal rendering. If the English derivative has the same meaning as the Latin word, no harm can ensue from the use of it. But the charge of some of the enemies of Latin that the translation vitiates the English style may have more than a grain of truth if the Latin-English jargon is allowed. On the other hand, there is no greater incentive to literary judgment and appreciation than comes from the consideration of how to express with precision a thought from a foreign tongue.

Antiquities, historical allusions, literary parallels, mythology, political institutions, English derivatives, syntax, composition, style—all claim attention in the customary four years of high-school work. But whatever devices may be employed for their systematic development, they should be made contributory to the general principle—the careful balancing of the sensitive appropriation and the analytical understanding. It is the desirable end to combine finely, if we may use the words in their peculiar sense, the sentient and the intelligent values.

As the pupil proceeds in his Latin work, he should work more and more in unconscious accord with the rule. The more carefully the balance between the extremes has been preserved in the earlier stages, the sooner will the process be satisfactory, the more certainly will interest in the continuance of the work be assured.

"WHAT CONSTITUTES A STATE?"

BY CHARLES FORSTER SMITH
University of Wisconsin

Sir William Jones calls his well-known ode "What Constitutes a State?" an imitation of Alcaeus and puts for superscription the lines of Alcaeus, as quoted by Aristides. The passage is found in Aristides ii. 207, where the sophist represents Themistocles as having shown

ἀληθῆ τὸν λόγον ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι πόλις ἢ ἀνδράσι καὶ οὐ πλίνθοις ἐστεφάνωται, ὡς ἄρα οὐ λίθοι οὐδὲ ξύλα οὐδὲ τεχνὴ τεκτόνων αἱ πόλεις εἶεν, ἀλλ' ὅπου ποτ' ἂν ὦσιν ἄνδρες αὐτοὺς σφῆζειν εἰδότες, ἐνταῦθα καὶ τείχη καὶ πόλεις.

The sentiment may be older than Alcaeus, for Plutarch makes Lycurgus, when consulted whether it were advisable to inclose the city with a wall, reply (*Lycurg.* 19): οὐκ ἂν εἴη ἀτείχιστος πόλις ἅτις ἀνδράσι καὶ οὐ πλίνθοις ἐστεφάνωται. But everything concerning Lycurgus is too mythical to insist upon this. The application of the sentiment, at any rate, is good enough to be Spartan. King Agesilaus expressed the same idea (*Plut. Ἀποφθέγματα* 29):

ἄλλου δὲ ἐπισητοῦντος διὰ τί ἀτείχιστος ἡ Σπάρτη, ἐπιδείξας τοὺς πολίτας ἐξωπισμένους, ταῦτά ἐστιν, εἶπε, τὰ Λακεδαιμονίων τείχη.

And another good answer of the same Agesilaus is quoted by Plutarch (*Ἀποφθ.* 30):

ἄλλου δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπισητοῦντος, οὐ λίθοις δεῖ καὶ ξύλοις τετειχίσθαι τὰς πόλεις, ἔφη, ταῖς δὲ τῶν ἐνοικούντων ἀρεταῖς.

Aristides refers to the sentiment again (i. 535) as

τὸ παλαιὸν τοῦτο, ὡς ἄρα οὐ τείχη οὐδὲ ὥδεῖα οὐδὲ ὁ τῶν ἀψύχων κόσμος αἱ πόλεις εἶεν, ἀλλ' ἄνδρες αὐτοὶ εἰδότες θαρρεῖν.

It had doubtless become a rhetorical commonplace, for Aristides uses it yet again in addressing the Rhodians, who had suffered from an earthquake (i. 555), saying:

οὐκ οἰκίαι καλῶς ἐστεγμέναι οὐδὲ λίθοι τειχῶν εἰς δεδομημένοι οὐδὲ στενωποὶ τε καὶ νεώρεια ἢ πόλις, ἀλλ' ἄνδρες χρῆσθαι τοῖς αἰεὶ παροῦσι δυνάμενοι.

Appian puts this rhetorical commonplace into the mouth of Pompey (*Bell. civ.* ii. 50), viz.:

συναγαγὼν ὅσοι τε ἦσαν ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν καλουμένων ἱππέων καὶ τοῖς στρατὸν ἅπαντα εἰς ἐπήκοον ἔλεξεν ὥδε· καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν πόλιν ἐξέλιπον, ὧ ἄνδρες, ὑπερ ἐλευθερίας τοῖς ἐπιούσι πολεμοῦντες, οὐ τὰ οἰκήματα πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἄνδρας εἶναι νομίζοντες.

A passage in one of Cicero's letters (*Ad Atticum* vii. 11. 3) would indicate that Pompey actually used the sentiment in the speech above referred to:

"Urbem tu relinquis? [Pompey is asked] ergo idem si Galli venirent." "Non est," inquit, "in parietibus res publica." "At in aris et facis." "Fecit Themistocles."

Couple with this now a passage from Justinus, and we not only see that it was a rhetorical commonplace, but we can also infer who and what gave it currency as such. Justinus (ii. 12. 15) says:

Adventante igitur Xerxe (consulentibus Delphis oraculum responsum fuerat, salutem muris ligneis tuerentur) Themistocles navium praesidium demonstratum ratus persuadet omnibus, patriam municipes esse, non moenia, civitatemque non in aedificiis, sed in civibus positam: melius itaque salutem navibus quam urbi commissuros.

Themistocles, in persuading the Athenians to abandon the city and stake all upon the fleet, had perhaps used the sentiment before, as may be inferred from the passage in Justinus; he certainly employed it with tremendous effect in one of the momentous debates just before the great sea-fight. When a conference had been called about withdrawing to the isthmus, before Eurybiades could put before the generals the object of the meeting, Themistocles broke out with an urgent appeal not to withdraw. Adimantus interrupted him: "Themistocles, at the games those who start too soon get lashed." "But those who remain behind are not crowned," was the quick retort. Then, as Themistocles went on, Adimantus addressed him again, bidding him be silent as one who had no country, and urging Eurybiades not to allow a man to vote who was without a state. And then came the patriotic and burning response which made Alcaeus' sentiment ever after a rhetorical commonplace (Hdt. viii. 61):

τότε δὴ ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς ἐκείνον τε καὶ τοὺς Κορινθίους πολλὰ τε καὶ κακὰ ἔλεγε, δυντοῦσι τε ἐδῆλου λόγῳ ὡς εἴη καὶ πόλις καὶ γῆ μέζων ἤπερ ἐκείνοισι, ἐστ' ἂν διεκόσται νέες σφεῖς ἔωσι πεπληρωμένοι.¹

So completely did these words represent the Athenians' spirit in quitting their city, and so fully did results at Salamis justify them, that they were doubtless straightway on every man's tongue.

An echo of the famous Themistoclean application of it, rather than of the original Alcaean sentiment, I am fain to see in the words of Aeschylus, himself a hero of Salamis, as uttered by the Persian messenger to Xerxes' mother (*Pers.* 351 f.):

Ἀτῶσσα. ἐτ' ἄρ' Ἀθηνῶν ἐστ' ἀπόρθητος πόλις;

Ἀγγελος. ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἔρκος ἐστὶν ἀσφαλές.

¹ This is repeated in substance from Herodotus by Plutarch *Them.* 2.

It is natural, then, that we find the Alcaean sentiment used by both the other great tragic poets in the age that followed the Persian War. In Sophocles the priest, imploring Oedipus to do something for the land ravaged by pestilence, says (*O. T.* 56 f.):

ὥς οὐδέν ἐστιν οὔτε πύργος οὔτε ναῦς
ἔρημος ἀνδρῶν μὴ συνοικούντων ἔσω.

And Euripides uses it in the lost play *Phrixus*,

αἱ γὰρ πόλεις εἰς ἄνδρες, οὐκ ἐρημία,

a fragment of which we have not the context.

Quite certainly Themistocles' example and ringing words were in Thucydides' mind when he made Nicias say to the disheartened Athenians, as they were setting off from their camp on that fateful retreat from Syracuse (vii. 77): *λογίζεσθε ὅτι αὐτοὶ πόλιν εὐθύς ἐστε ὅποι ἂν καθέξησθε*,¹ the speech concluding with *ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλιν, καὶ οὐ τείχη οὐδὲ νῆες ἀνδρῶν κεναί*.² Themistocles' example and the spirit of the Athenians of Salaminian times were doubtless in Pericles' mind, too, when at the opening of the Peloponnesian War he urged the Athenians to be ready to abandon land and houses in the country of Attica and keep guard over the sea and the city, and to make lamentation, not for houses and land, but for human bodies, *οὐ γὰρ τὰδε τοὺς ἀνδρας, ἀλλ' οἱ ἀνδρες ταῦτα κτῶνται*—which is, of course, an application of Alcaeus' sentiment.

Demosthenes, in the *De corona*, makes very effective use of the sentiment which had become so widely current at Athens after Themistocles applied it. Aeschines had ridiculed the wall-building of Demosthenes for which it was proposed to crown him; and in a famous passage, often quoted by rhetoricians, Demosthenes makes reply (xviii. 299):

οὐ λίθοις ἐτείχισα τὴν πόλιν οὐδὲ πλίνθοις ἐγώ, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τούτοις μέγιστον τῶν ἐμαντοῦ φρονῶ· ἀλλ' ἐὰν τὸν ἐμὸν τειχισμὸν βούλη δικαίως σκοπεῖν, εὐρήσεις ὄπλα καὶ πόλεις καὶ τόπους καὶ λιμένας καὶ ναὺς καὶ ἵππους καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀμυνομένοις. ταῦτα προῦβαλόμην ἐγὼ πρὸ τῆς Ἀττικῆς, ὅσον ἦν ἀνθρωπίνῳ λογισμῷ δυνατόν, καὶ τούτοις ἐτείχισα τὴν χώραν, οὐχὶ τὸν κύκλον τοῦ Πειραιῶς οὐδὲ τοῦ ἁστεως.

¹ For the following words of Nicias—*καὶ ἄλλη οὐδεμία ὑμᾶς τῶν ἐν Σικελίᾳ οὐτ' ἂν ἐπιόντας δέξαιτο ῥαδίως*—are only a paraphrase of Themistocles' words, *οὐδαμοὺς γὰρ Ἑλλήνων αὐτοὺς ἐπιόντας ἀποκρούσεσθαι* (*Hdt.* viii. 61).

² The version in Dio C. (lvi. 5. 3), *ἀνθρωποὶ γὰρ πον πόλιν ἐστίν, οὐκ οἰκίαι οὐδὲ στοαὶ οὐδ' ἀγοραὶ ἀνδρῶν κεναί*, is evidently a direct imitation of this Thucydidean passage. And Blomfield (*ad Aesch. Pers.* 351) cites from the *Ἀποφθέγματα* of Plutarch a *senarius proverbialis*, *ἄνδρες γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ πόλεις, οὐκ οἰκίαι*, which is practically identical in form with the passage in Thucydides vii. 77.

Very eloquent too is the application made of the thought as expressed by Tacitus in Otho's appeal to his soldiers (*Hist.* i. 84):

Quid? vos pulcherrimam hanc urbem domibus et tectis et congestu lapidum stare creditis? Muta ista et inania intercidere ac reparari promisca sunt. Aeternitas rerum, et pax gentium, et mea cum vestra salus incolumitate Senatus firmatur.

It may be mentioned, finally, that Lucian puts this sentiment into Solon's mouth, whom he represents as saying to Anacharsis, in the dialogue of that name (*Anacharsis* 20):

οὐκοῦν διὰ βραχείων προακούσαι χρή σε ἅ περὶ πόλεως καὶ πολιτῶν ἡμῶν δοκεῖ· πόλιν γὰρ ἡμεῖς οὐ τὰ οἰκοδομήματα ἡγούμεθα εἶναι, οἷον τείχη καὶ ἱερὰ καὶ νεωσοίκους, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὥσπερ σῶμά τι ἐδραῖων καὶ ἀκίνητον ὑπάρχειν ἐς ὑποδοχὴν καὶ ἀσφάλειαν τῶν πολιτευομένων, τὸ δὲ πᾶν Κῦρος ἐν τοῖς πολίταις τιθέμεθα· τούτους γὰρ εἶναι τοὺς ἀναπληροῦντας καὶ διατάττοντας καὶ ἐπιτελοῦντας ἕκαστα καὶ φυλάττοντας, οἷόν τι ἐν ἡμῶν ἐκάστῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ.

Solon antedated Themistocles and the Persian War by a hundred years, but in Lucian's dialogue he clearly reflects the spirit of Themistoclean Athens.

The sentiment did not escape application by our myriad-minded dramatist (Shaks. *Coriol.* iii. 1), for which he need not be supposed indebted to any of our ancient sources. "What is the city but the people?" asks Sicinius, "True, the people are the city," answer the citizens.

Notes

Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to Campbell Bonner, 1512½ Demonbreun Street, Nashville, Tenn.

THE HOMERIC PHRASE εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε

δαῖηρ αὐτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνῶπιδος, εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε. (*Il.* iii. 180)

This formula is found in five other passages, namely *Il.* xi. 762; xxiv. 426; *Od.* xv. 268; xix. 315; xxiv. 289. Apart from the suggestion of Georg Curtius (*Curt. Stud.* I. 286) that we should read ἦ for εἰ, there are two interpretations offered. Some believe that the phrase contains an expression of doubt that the happy past could ever have been true (see, besides others, Leaf and Seymour on *Il.* iii. 180 and Merry on *Od.* xv. 68). Others take just the contrary view, finding instead of an expression of doubt an assurance that the past was really once present (see Monro and Ameis-Hentze). The difficulties in each of these views will be realized by anyone who tries to apply them to all six passages. The supporters of the second interpretation have ridiculed the first as applied to the passages in the *Iliad*, but themselves have great difficulty in explaining the development in meaning when the phrase seems to modify a single noun like ἐμὸν παῖδα in *Od.* xxiv. 289 (cf. Ameis-Hentze on *Od.* xv. 268, Anhang, where it is suggested that the speaker is not assuring the person addressed, but comforting himself with an "aside").

I presume that hundreds, untrammelled by notes and parallel passages, have translated *Il.* iii. 180 "shameless, if ever there was one," taking εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε, like εἰ τις καὶ ἄλλος, as giving a superlative effect to κυνῶπιδος. The meaning thus obtained is here so infinitely superior to either of the others that it is worth while to inquire whether the parallel passages really render it impossible. In *Od.* xxiv. 289 we have ἐμὸν παῖδ', εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε, δύσμορον, "my son ill-fated, if ever there was one," a translation certainly superior to "how many years is it since you entertained my son, if ever he lived (*as he certainly did or I can hardly believe it*), ill-fated one." There is also no difficulty in *Od.* xix. 315, which runs

ἐπεὶ οὐ τοῖσι σημάτωντορ' εἰς ἐνὶ οἴκῳ,

οἷος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκε μετ' ἀνδράσι, εἰ ποτ' ἔην γε,

"since there are not such masters in the house as Odysseus was among men, if ever there was such," i. e., in the highest degree. There is a

marked similarity between this passage and *Il.* xi. 762, ὥς ἔον, εἴ ποτ' ἔον γε, μετ' ἀνδράσιν, the words with which Nestor closes the description of the glorious deeds of his youth. The parallelism of the two passages is particularly fortunate because the view that εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε is an expression of doubt that the person in question ever existed finds its strongest support in the use of the phrase by Telemachus, Penelope, and Laertes when speaking of the long-absent Odysseus, while the weakness of this view is particularly apparent in *Il.* xi. 762, since Nestor neither doubts his own existence nor the glories of his youth. The use of the first singular εἴ ποτ' ἔον would at first sight settle the question absolutely against the translation "if ever there was such." But, while the editors universally give ἔον, the weight of MSS authority is entirely for ἔην, which is the reading of Venetus A, Venetus B, Laurentianus XXXII. 3 and 15, and others, while ἔον has the support only of Lipsiensis and some minor codices. Turning to *Od.* xv. 268 we read

ἐξ Ἰθάκης γένος εἰμὶ, πατὴρ δέ μοι ἔστιν Ὀδυσσεύς,
εἴ ποτ' ἔην· νῦν δ' ἤδη ἀπέφθιτο λυγρὸν δλεθρον.

Here, again, we seem to have conclusive evidence that one or other of the ordinary interpretations is correct, since there is apparently no word such as *κυνῶπις*, *δύσμορος*, or *τοῖος* for εἴ ποτ' ἔην to qualify. I venture, however, to suggest that there is here a play upon the meaning of the name Ὀδυσσεύς, such as we have in the words of Autolycus in *Od.* xix. 407:

πολλοῖσιν γὰρ ἐγὼ γε ὀδυσσάμενος τὸδ' ἰκάνω,
τῷ δ' Ὀδυσσεὺς ὄνομ' ἔστω ἐπώνυμον.

It has been held (cf. Ebeling *Lex. Hom.*) that ὀδυσσάμενος is best taken here in a passive meaning and that Ὀδυσσεύς, according to this etymology, means "The Hated" and not "The Hater." In xv. 268 we might, therefore, translate "and my father is Odysseus, the Hated, if ever there was one." with reference to his constant ill-fortune. It is perhaps worth while to point out that this passage is part of the Theoclymenus episode which has been judged by so many critics to be an interpolation (cf. Blass, *Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee*, p. 248, and Hennings, *Homers Odyssee*, p. 111).

There remains but one passage,

ἐπεὶ οὐ ποτ' ἐμὸς πάϊς, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε,
λήθεται ἐνὶ μεγάροισι θεῶν. (*Il.* xxiv. 426)

Here it must be admitted that, if the interpretation for which I am contending is correct, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε had acquired so much of a formal char-

acter that it could be used even when not attached to an epithet like *κυνῶπις*; for here we should have to translate "it is good to give gifts to the gods, for least of all men did my son forget the gods; therefore have they remembered him." The meaning at least is excellent, while it is difficult to see why Priam, when seeking to ransom the body of his son so lately killed, should express either a doubt that he had ever existed, or an assurance that he really once had a son. Further, the supporters of the other views must also assume a development of the phrase to a formal meaning and a development less easy to follow.

A. G. LAIRD

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

PLAUTUS *TRIN.* 368

Sapienti aetas condimentum, sapiens aetati cibust.

Though rejected by Ritschl, this verse is defended by Haupt, Ussing, and Brix, and is retained by Leo and most of the more recent editors. It seems, however, to be still in need of satisfactory interpretation. Freeman and Sloman pronounce it meaningless and omit it; Goetz and Schoell obelize *sapiens*, and Brix and Morris admit finding the concrete use of the word rather strange and hard; and all explanations that I have seen¹ seem to me to involve the clauses in hopeless inconsistency with each other.

I believe that the verse is sound in text and that it stands in its proper place in A and in our editions. Two suggestions will, I hope, contribute something toward clearing up its meaning. One is that *sapienti* and *sapiens* may be used here not as substantives, but to refer, perhaps somewhat loosely, to *ingenio* of the preceding verse. To take it so relieves in some measure the harshness referred to, by substituting *sapiens ingenium* for "the wise man," in much the same way that Livy (i. 9. 16) writes *muliebre ingenium* for "women." The other is that the close connection that exists between the two clauses has been generally overlooked, and that too much has, in consequence, been read into the second one. The terms here used may very well have been drawn from some such expression, probably proverbial, as that quoted by Cicero (*Fin.* ii. 28. 90) from Socrates, *cibi condimentum esse famem*. However that may be, the terms are here, and the relation between them is emphasized. Between native wisdom and age, our verse declares, the relation is that of a viand and its seasoning: the first clause asserts that age is, with reference to wisdom,

¹ Possibly with the exception of Morris'; I cannot be sure from his note whether or not he understands the verse to mean that age subsists upon wisdom.

(merely) a seasoning added to it; the second says nothing more, I think, than that wisdom is, conversely, as far as age is concerned, the viand (that is, the really important part of the combination) to which age is added as a seasoning. This makes the expression somewhat redundant, it must be admitted; but one has only to look back through the scene to which this verse belongs, and especially at vss. 305-12 and vss. 318-22, to see that such redundancy is not at all foreign to Philto's moralizing style. Lysiteles, too, indulges in something like it at vs. 329. On the other hand, this view avoids the inconsistency involved in interpretations which represent wisdom as being in any sense *consumed* by age. That *cibus* does in most connections denote something that is consumed or is designed to be consumed, is of course true; but food is not consumed by the seasoning that is applied to it.

I should therefore put a semicolon at the end of vs. 367, and render the couplet thus: "Not by age, but by nature is wisdom gained; for native wisdom age is seasoning, but under age the food is wisdom."

CHARLES N. COLE

OBERLIN COLLEGE

CAESAR *BELLUM CIVILE* iii. 18. 4

In the February number of the *Journal* Professor Shorey makes an interesting note on οὐδὲν δέουμαι, with the colloquial tone of "I have no use for." In Caesar's *Civil War* iii. 18. 4 *quid mihi opus est* seems to me to have the same tone, viz.:

"quid mihi," inquit, "aut vita aut civitate opus est, quam beneficio Caesaris habere videbor."

In the Latin instance, *opus est* might seem to have taken up what would be the proper etymological sense of its synonym, *usus est*, just as it appropriated the construction of *usus est*.

Examples more or less similar may be found cited by Lewis and Short, s. v. *opus*. III. A. 2, and Horace *Sat.* ii. 6. 116 (*mus rusticus loquitur*) is a complete parallel: *haud mihi vita est opus hac*, and is compared by Professor Rolfe in his note to the locution "I have no use for." Kiessling's note on *est opus* is curiously strained: "ein Gegensatz zu dem *urbanus*, der gezwungen ist solche Unruhe erdulden zu müssen, hat er dies ja nicht nötig." In view of the Caesar parallel, it would seem quite untenable.

E. W. F.

"ABLATIVE ABSOLUTES"?

Noting this plural on p. 161 of the February number of the *Journal*, may I ask if it would not be better for our pupils if we teachers spoke of "ablatives absolute," just as we say "courts martial," "lords temporal," and the like? We should thereby at least not obscure for them what the thing is. I myself prefer to teach it as the "absolute ablative," or the "absolved ablative" (i. e., absolved from construction), or the "scot-free" ablative, the "run-away" ablative—anything to make the phrase carry some sense to the learner and save him from parrot-repetition of unexplained conglomerates. Conglomerate-teaching leads to results such as the following: I recently had a class of a dozen beginners in Greek, all having previously studied Latin. On being asked which was the substantive in the phrase "ablative absolute," all but one answered "absolute"!

In passing, may I ask if the very useful word "substantive" has quite disappeared from grammatical terminology? The word "noun" seems to have taken its place; but then what is to take the place of "noun," which properly includes both adjective and substantive.

L. L. FORMAN

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Reports from the Classical Field

It is the purpose of this department to keep the readers of the *Journal* informed of events and undertakings in the classical field, and to make them familiar with the varying conditions under which classical work is being done, and with the aims and experiences of those who are in one way or another endeavoring to increase its effectiveness. The success of the department will naturally depend to a great extent on the co-operation of the individual readers themselves. Every one interested in the *Journal* and in what it is trying to do is therefore cordially invited to report anything of interest that may come to his notice. Inquiries and suggestions will also be useful in directing the attention of the editors to things which may otherwise escape their notice. Communications should be addressed to J. J. Schlicher, 1811 N. Eighth Street, Terre Haute, Ind.

Indiana University.—A Department of Comparative Philology has been established, in charge of Associate Professor Guido H. Stempel, who has been transferred from the Department of English. Courses are provided for students of the classics as well as of English and German. A course in Sanskrit is being given by Acting Assistant Professor Edgar H. Sturtevant of the Department of Latin.

University of Cincinnati.—Professor Burnam has in preparation an *Ineditum Prudentianum*, which is to be issued from the press of A. Picard et Fils, Paris, next summer—the text in Latin, preface, index, etc., in French.

Professor G. H. Allen, in connection with his course in archaeology, provides for a study of the history of the western provinces with their industries and trade routes.

The Greek Seminar is discussing literary and syntactical questions, the Latin Seminar is devoting itself to Lucretian lexicography and certain questions concerning Roman religion.

THE STUDY OF LATIN POETRY IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Several months ago a circular was sent to a number of Latin teachers in high schools and academies, asking for information on certain points connected with the teaching of Latin poetry in their schools. The response to the questions was generous, and a summary of the replies which were obtained will, no doubt, be of interest both to secondary and to college teachers. In all, 121 answers were received, of which the great majority, 93, came from the territory of the Association, where the larger part of the circulars had been sent. The proportion of circulars which came back with answers from teachers outside the Association was at least equally high. The replies came from schools which may be regarded as representative in their respective sections, and possibly rather above the average than below it.

Time Devoted to Poetry. The time given to poetry varies from 16 to 70 weeks, the greater number of the schools ranging between 30 and 40 weeks; 36 to 38 weeks may be taken as the average; 33 schools have 36 weeks, but only 5 have less than 30 weeks; 15 have 38, 18 have 40, and 19 more than 40. In some cases there are five periods a week, and in some only four, the fifth day in the latter being given, as a rule, to composition. The periods themselves vary greatly, from 30 to 60 minutes, with the great majority from 40 to 50 minutes.

In some schools in the East—Phillips Exeter Academy, for example, and the Haverford School in Pennsylvania—prose and poetry are read side by side during the last three years of the course. In the latter institution the number of periods devoted to poetry in these years is 40, 30, and 130 respectively. The information on this point is unfortunately incomplete, since the question did not specifically ask for it. But the number of schools which follow this practice, or one like it, is probably very small.

The Authors Read. As was to be expected, a large majority of the schools reported six books of Virgil's *Aeneid* as the backbone of their course in poetry. Of the rest, 15 schools read more than six books of the *Aeneid*, while 14 read less.

Ovid is read in over half of the schools which reported (63 out of 121). The amount read, however, is not so large. It averages about 1,200 to 1,500 lines, and rarely exceeds 2,000. In New England 9 schools out of 11 read Ovid; in Michigan, 10 out of 13; in Illinois, 11 out of 19. In some other states little or no Ovid is read.

The *Eclogues* of Virgil are read in 14 schools, mostly in the East.

The *Odes* of Horace are read in 7 schools scattered over the country, and there is at least one high school which reports among its textbooks the *Ars poetica*.

Written Translation. In 51 of the 121 schools written translation has no regular place in the daily work of the classes in poetry (in 9 there is none, in 17 little, in 19 the translation is written only in examinations, and in 6 only striking or difficult passages are occasionally written). All the other schools make written translation a more or less frequent exercise in the regular course of their work. There is no striking uniformity of practice, but 10 per cent. of the text, or one exercise a week, seems to be the most common proportion. Three schools have all the review written out each day.

In some cases the written translation is put on the board and criticized before the class, and in one school a passage is written on paper each day by two or three students, and their translations are compared in detail and criticized by the class at the beginning of the hour. In 4 schools written work is required of individual students whenever their oral work has been poor. One teacher asks the pupils at the end of each book to select passages which they consider especially good, and to write translations of these.

The Use of Metrical Translations. As many as 49 teachers make no use, or practically no use, of metrical translations, and 13 more reported that they make but little use of them; 55 teachers reported that they use metrical translations.

Of these, 9 refer the class to the translations, 3 urging them to read the whole *Aeneid*, one allowing the pupils access to the translations after the first two books have been translated, and another at the end of each book to give them a comprehensive view of it. The great majority of the teachers, however, read the translations to the class themselves; 7 read fine or difficult passages, 6 read several different translations of the same passage for comparison, 11 use them at the end of each book, or at the end of the study of poetry, for review. In 3 schools the pupils make reports, selecting passages to read to the class as illustrations. One teacher frequently reads a metrical translation, while the class follow in their Latin texts.

The question was not asked what translations were used, but 14 mentioned this incidentally. Of these, 9 used Conington's, 3 Dryden's, 1 Morris', and 1 Cranch's. Phillips Andover Academy reports that it has "what is perhaps the best collection of metrical translations in America."

The same question in the circular brought also another bit of incidental information. Some teachers understood it to refer to translations made by the students, and of these, 9 require metrical translations (1 frequently; 1, 40 to 50 lines; 1, as much as the class allows; 1, each term; 1, each week; 1, each month; and 1, three or four times a year); 3 of them require the translations to be made in hexameter; 7 other teachers do not require metrical translation, but recommend and encourage it, in some cases, as they say, with very satisfactory results. It is to be regretted that the question did not ask for more definite information on this interesting subject.

What Is Done with Scansion. Every one of the 121 teachers who sent replies includes scansion as a part of the work in Latin poetry. The degree of proficiency which is set up as a goal varies considerably, as do also the methods by which it is to be obtained, and the conception of what is the most essential thing to be aimed at. But in all cases scansion is apparently undertaken seriously and with the determination to make something of it, even if the results may not always measure up to what the teacher considers a desirable standard.

In a good majority of the schools, 75 of 121, the work in scansion is begun at the beginning of the study of poetry, either on the very first day or during the first week or two. A considerable number—23 in all—begin it at the end of about a month's time, when the pupils have overcome the first strangeness of the poetic style; 5 more begin after several hundred lines have been read, which amounts to about the same thing; 3 do not begin till after some months have passed; and in 3 other schools, where Ovid precedes Virgil, scansion is not taken up till the latter author is reached. In 5 schools it is begun after the first book of Virgil.

In quite a number of schools the teacher scans to the class from the start, or the class scan by imitation or in concert with the teacher for a few weeks before the principles are studied. In a few schools the scanning is done entirely by imitation. Many teachers start with a study of the English hexameter. Most frequently, however, the principles are studied first, one teacher having his pupils do this while they are still reading Cicero. The disposition is universal to confine

the study of principles to what is absolutely indispensable. Now and then one finds an inductive method of some sort applied with success.

In most cases from 5 to 15 minutes a day are devoted to scansion, either throughout the entire time given to poetry, or for some weeks or months, till a certain degree of proficiency is reached. In most of the latter cases, practice is then continued less frequently or at irregular intervals till the end of the year. Sometimes whole periods, or half periods several times a week, are used for scansion, especially at the beginning. It occurs even that the whole first week is used for this purpose, before any translating is done at all.

On the whole, the place given to scansion is considerable, in some cases as much as a fifth or a fourth of the whole time which is devoted to poetry, and not infrequently the whole text is scanned by the class one or more times.

Oral and Written Scansion. Five schools report only oral and 5 only written scansion; 37 report more oral than written, 11 more written than oral, and 6 as much of one as of the other. In the majority of cases the written precedes the oral, 60 as against 23 in which oral scansion comes first. Very often the written work is done only in the beginning, until the principles are fixed in the minds of the pupils. In some cases written scansion is confined to the tests, or is resorted to when hard lines are met. These, and sometimes all the written scansion, are done on the board.

In 16 schools preparation is made at home, but the written scansion is all done off-hand in class. In 28 cases it is always handed in on paper; 52 schools use both methods, though some show a preference for one or the other. In 4 schools the written scansion is all done in a notebook, which is handed in from time to time, and in 2 others a notebook is kept for all difficult or peculiar lines.

Attitude of the Pupils toward Scansion. As might be expected, many of the replies on this point were to the effect that individual pupils differ greatly. Fifty schools reported that the interest is fair, or that it varies with the pupil's ability or his sense of rhythm, or the progress which he has made in scanning. In nine cases the pupils like scanning better as they become more skilful, but in one case it is reported that they lose interest as time goes on. Only in one instance is a distinction made between the girls and the boys, and then with the qualification that there are exceptions.

Of the schools which gave an unqualified reply to the question, the overwhelming majority reported that the pupils enjoy scanning and are interested in it. The number is 47 as against 10 in which their attitude is indifferent or hostile. Some like scanning better than translating (occasionally an otherwise poor student can scan well), while others prefer to deal with the subject-matter of the author.

In very few cases are any students excused from scanning, either for inability or for proficiency, though the backward ones are sometimes given more attention and the proficient are sometimes excused from written work. In oral scanning the point is made in some of the replies that the scanning of the proficient helps and encourages the weak.

What Is of Most Importance in Scanning. The teachers were asked to indicate the relative importance which they give in their oral exercises to ictus, quantity, word-accent, and division into feet. Column I gives the number of those who assigned first place to one or the other of these elements, column II those who assigned second place, column X those who replied that they do not observe them in their scanning at all.

| | I | II | X |
|-------------------------|----|----|----|
| Ictus..... | 17 | 9 | 16 |
| Quantity..... | 45 | 12 | 5 |
| Word-accent..... | 1 | 13 | 36 |
| Division into feet..... | 5 | 13 | 23 |

In some cases first or second place was assigned equally to several of the elements mentioned. These combinations give the following additional figures:

| | I | II |
|-----------------------------------|----|----|
| Ictus (in combination)..... | 21 | 10 |
| Quantity (in combination)..... | 31 | 0 |
| Word-accent (in combination)..... | 16 | 5 |
| Feet (in combination)..... | 15 | 5 |

The remark is often made that the ictus and the division into feet (sometimes also the word-accent) will take care of themselves. Some make a strenuous fight against the ictus, not always with entire success. A helpful practice is followed by a number who scan sentences rather than lines, and observe the sense-pauses rather than the divisions of the verse. Frequently a distinction is made between formal scanning and what is called metrical reading, and both are sometimes practiced by the same class. The aim is quite evident to make scanning more intelligent, and it is only occasionally that the ictus is upheld to the disregard of everything else, or that one meets a remark like this: "Scanning is division into feet. Ictus and word-accent I know nothing about."

The question was asked whether the teacher had at any time tried to have the pupils retain the word-accent, while at the same time observing the ictus. Of the 121 who replied, 51 say that they have tried it more or less extensively. The results do not appear to be very encouraging. Only 3 state that they are satisfactory; 7 report fair success; in 15 cases the results were indifferent, while 13 attempts were a complete failure. Nine replied that the bright pupils, or the musically inclined, succeed, but the rest do not. There appears to be quite a general willingness to give the method a trial, and a number of the correspondents volunteer the information that they believe it is the right way, in spite of their lack of success. Others are either skeptical, or vigorously outspoken in their condemnation of it. Among those who believe in it the feeling is prevalent that it takes more time and is more difficult than the other method.

Book Reviews

Lysias: Selected Speeches. With Introduction, Notes, and Appendices. By CHARLES DARWIN ADAMS. New York: American Book Co., 1905. Pp. 400. \$1.50.

Lysias' Ausgewählte Reden. Mit einem Anhang aus Xenophons *Hellenika*. Für den Schulgebrauch herausgegeben von ANDREAS WEIDNER. 2. Auflage besorgt von PAUL VOGEL. Leipzig: G. Freytag; Wien: F. Tempsky, 1905. Pp. 164. M. 1.50.

The speeches of Lysias selected for Professor Adams' edition are eight in number: "Against Eratosthenes," "For Mantisheus," "On the Estate of Aristophanes," "Against the Grain Dealers," "For the Cripple," "Defense," "Against Diogiton," and "On the Constitution." The text and notes (which are where they should be, at the bottom of the page) are preceded by an introduction on the life, works, and style of Lysias, with an account of the revolutions of 411 and 404 B. C., and followed by appendices on chronology, legal procedure, rhetorical terms, money, and prices at Athens, manuscripts, bibliography, critical notes, and indices.

The choice of the orations annotated is not open to serious criticism, though some will wonder at the introduction of the fragment "On the Constitution," which seems comparatively unimportant and certainly is difficult. As Mr. Adams himself says, "the meaning is not always clear. One must read and reread before being sure of the meaning of some sentences, and some are capable of widely differing interpretations." This oration hardly compensates for the missing one "On the Sacred Olive."

None will doubt the editor's grasp and his clear and scholarly treatment of his material. He has given heed to the explanation of more difficult and unusual constructions, particularly to the force of tenses and particles, but "rhetorical matters have received especial attention," in the belief that "with the marked tendency toward simplicity and directness in public speech, we are ready for a new appreciation of Lysias."

The typography and appearance of the book (and of this series) is excellent; it has a minimum of errors. The note, p. 301, "Κολλυτοῦ: a deme lying just north of the Acropolis," is somewhat dogmatic (cf. Judeich, *Topogr. v. Athen*, p. 157).

As the book "has been prepared primarily for the use of college freshmen," it invites criticism on this score, and here many will part company with the views of the editor. The volume contains about 73 pages of text and 327 of introduc-

tion, notes, and appendices; were the sizes of type considered, the ratio would be about 50 to 350. Happy the instructor whose freshmen in the time allotted to Lysias will read and digest seven pages of explanatory matter to one of text! The warning sounded in a recent editorial in this *Journal* seems to the present reviewer to be opportune. Hasten the time, however, when a series of avowedly advanced editions of Greek authors shall be needed in our country! Naturally, the voluminousness of this volume permits many valuable additions. For example, the appendix on "Money and Prices at Athens" is excellent, especially for the remarks on the "real value of the drachma as measured by its purchasing power."

Dr. Vogel has conceived his problem of revising the edition of Weidner (1893) very differently. Fourteen orations, with introductions and a considerable selection from Xenophon's *Hellenica*, are given in 164 pages. Emphasis is laid on the fact that this is not merely a "Schulausgabe" but a "Schülerausgabe, die also stofflich dem *Lehrer nichts zu bieten hat*." The "kurzgefasster Kommentar" is bound separately and has not come into the hands of the reviewer. If it be as good as the part before us, the edition is very worthy.

CHARLES H. WELLER

UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

Sophocles' Antigone. Translated by ROBERT WHITELAW. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by J. CHURTON COLLINS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906. Pp. xlix + 56. \$0.35.

Euripides' Alcestis. Translated by H. KYNASTON. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by J. CHURTON COLLINS. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906. Pp. xxx + 44. \$0.35.

In reviewing Professor Churton Collins' edition of Matthew Arnold's *Merope*, to which the *Electra* of Sophocles was added as a supplement (*Classical Journal*, November, 1906, p. 40), we remarked that "for the increasing class of non-Greek students it would be better to reverse what he has done, and, instead of editing the *Merope* and merely appending the *Electra*, to edit the Sophoclean play and append the English, as the subject of secondary interest." In the two volumes now before us Mr. Collins applies the method which he adopted in editing the *Merope* to two of the most popular of Greek dramas, and, we must frankly admit, with great success.

The reasons for editing Greek plays for non-Greek students are well set forth in the preface common to both volumes (p. iv):

When we remember the educational value from a moral and sentimental point of view, the deep interest and attractiveness on the human and dramatic side, and above all the historical importance, in the fullest sense of the term, of the Greek masterpieces, can there be two opinions about the desirableness of including them in all our school courses of liberal studies? So essentially, indeed, does the influence of the mythology and poetry of ancient Greece penetrate our own classical literature, verse

and prose alike, that a reader who has no acquaintance with them is not only unable critically to understand either its evolution or its characteristics, but is perpetually at a loss to follow its commonest references and allusions. He is arrested at every step. No one, surely, could question that some acquaintance with that mythology and poetry is as indispensable to an intelligent study of our national classics from Chaucer to Tennyson, as the letters of the alphabet are to a written sentence. Of all intelligent literary study the basis must rest on some acquaintance with Greek tradition: turn where we will, it confronts us; its presence, particularly in our poetry, is simply ubiquitous. And to say that at least an introduction to it should be regarded as part of the equipment of every decently educated boy and girl is to say what probably few educationists would dispute. This information could be easily, as well as most pleasantly, imparted.

How far this use of translations of the classics, in connection with the teaching of English literature, is in vogue in the United States, we do not know. We do know, however, that, in one of the best schools of California, a translation of the *Antigone* has been used in the senior English class for some years past with great success; and, if such a custom became more common, not only would more sympathy with classical studies be aroused among non-classical students, but what is much more important—a better background would be furnished for the study of our best English poetry. Both as an editor and as a professor of English, Mr. Collins is doing much to popularize Greek literature, and his careful introductions and helpful, though concise, notes will do much to recommend these inexpensive books to general use.

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH

STANFORD UNIVERSITY,

The Roman System of Provincial Administration. By W. T. ARNOLD.

New edition, revised from the author's notes by E. S. SHUCKBURGH. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1906. Pp. xv + 288. \$2 net.

The methods which the Romans used in governing conquered territory varied in such large measure from generation to generation and from province to province that it is not an easy task to write a description of their administrative system which will be true of different periods and different parts of the empire. In his essay, as is well known, Arnold mastered these difficulties in an admirable way, so far as they could be overcome, by making his treatment partly historical, and by discussing separately the several provinces. His book still stands alone in its field, and contains an excellent résumé of the essential facts in the scheme of provincial government. Chapters i and ii are of an introductory character; chaps. iii-v trace the history of the administrative system from the acquisition of Sicily down to the accession of Constantine; chap. vi deals with provincial taxation, and vii with local government. The early death of the author prevented him from giving his work a thorough revision, and his friend and literary executor, Mr. Shuckburgh, who also died before the book appeared, limited his revision to the addition of some footnotes and the preparation of an index and a bibliography. Since the first edition appeared, almost all the published volumes of the

Corpus of Latin inscriptions have come out, and, although the author has taken some of the new material into consideration, much of it seems to have been neglected, notably special studies of certain provinces and the important articles in the dictionaries of Pauly-Wissowa and Daremberg-Saglio. Our knowledge of taxation, of local government, of frontier politics, and of economic conditions in the provinces has been much extended during the last three decades, and the treatment of these subjects might have been revised to advantage; but Arnold's book presents only a general outline of the subject, and fortunately the correctness of his sketch is not seriously affected by recent discoveries.

FRANK FROST ABBOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Latin Lessons for Beginners. By J. C. ROBERTSON and ADAM CARRUTHERS, University of Toronto. Toronto, Canada: W. J. Gage & Co., 1906. Pp. 398.

This work, being a revision of the *Primary Latin Book*, published in 1892, has very much to commend it as a useful book during the first stages of the study of Latin. It is perhaps too long to be mastered within a year, but in this respect it meets with approval on the part of the reviewer, who thinks that one of the chief causes for the poor training given to most pupils taking Latin in the high school is the fact that the first-year work is almost invariably a mere rush, and too soon the student is hurried into the serious reading of Caesar. A year and a half at least ought to be spent on introductory work, giving one a general knowledge of forms, syntax, etc., and also practice in the translation of easy stories.

Throughout the work the authors seem to have kept in mind the needs of the learner. The order of the lessons is in keeping with the idea of most of the latest writers. Space does not permit the discussion of a plan which to some appears to lack continuity. In the matter of the vocabulary not more than ten new words are given with each exercise. Word-lists are found at intervals of about five lessons. Fortunately it is not necessary for teachers to use these unless they so desire. The explanations of verb and case forms and syntactical points are sane and practical. Especially clear and satisfactory are the remarks on the use of the dative after certain verbs, the gerund and gerundive, the indirect question and the ablative absolute construction. There is no better way in which to gain a knowledge of forms and syntax than by the translation of sentences, and in particular from English into Latin. In connection with every exercise there is an opportunity for abundant practice in this direction.

It is hardly to be expected that the first edition of a book should be entirely free from errors. The following omissions in the marking of long quantities were noticed: p. 26, *copiās* (for *cōpiās*); p. 98, *pugnāverant* (*pūgnāverant*); p. 100, *Rōmanum* (*Rōmānum*); p. 103, *parēmus* (where the meaning indicates the use of *pārēmus* and *parēbat* (*pārēbat*); p. 173, *consuēvērunt* (*cōnsuēvērunt*); p. 190, *strinxī* (*strīnxī*); p. 214, *intellexī* and *intellectum* (*intellēxī*, *intellēctum*); p. 215, *intellexerat* (*intellēxerat*); p. 224, *coniunctūrus* (*coniūnctūrus*); p. 312,

nolite (*nōlītē*), *conāre* (*cōnāre*), *conāminī* (*cōnāminī*); p. 389, *primō* (*primō*). In the vocabulary for the lesson based on nouns of the fourth declension *lacus* is found, and yet nothing is given to tell us that it has the dative and ablative plural in *ubus*. On p. 167 we read *nōs sunt amīcī*. This error, of course, cannot be attributed to the authors. On pp. 226 and 227 *ascēsum* and *ascēnsū* are given, but the nominative is not to be seen in any of the vocabularies. *Pas* on p. 302 no doubt should be *pars*. The statement is made that "*rogō* is used like both *petō* and *quaerō*." This is misleading.

During the last few years, owing to the changing pedagogical ideas, a large number of beginners' books in Latin have appeared. The purpose and plan of Robertson and Carruthers' work seem to be sound, and it is safe to say that it meets all the requirements for thoroughness and interest.

WM. MCKINLEY HIGH SCHOOL
St. Louis

MAYNARD M. HART

Beginning Latin. By J. EDMUND BARSS. New York: University Publishing Co., 1906. Pp. x+322. \$1.00.

Mr. Barss's *Beginning Latin* arrests attention from the start; the plan of the exercises, a convenient test of general method in such books, strikes one as both new and ingenious. The method affects particularly the treatment of inflections. To quote from the Preface: "The uses of the various elements (of inflection) are explained, and very many simple exercises in the building of paradigms introduced. This method is found to give a conscious mastery of inflection in much less time than under the old system of memorizing paradigms." That is, instruction in inflections emphasizes the component parts of words, and insists on the advantage to the pupil, theoretical and demonstrated, of analyzing and building the forms he uses. Paradigms are as a rule not given, except of irregular words; instead their use is explained in Lesson XI, and thenceforward paradigm building is a constant exercise. The idea will be inherently attractive to many, and if wider experience upholds Mr. Barss's contention that time is saved, the partisans of memory work must meet this strong external argument.

Independent judgment and a practical sincerity are shown in the direct, unconventional expository style of this book and in the exclusion of some syntactical matters usually included in Latin primers. The clearness and simplicity of expression will save time in the recitation period; in many cases teachers will meet readier comprehension on the part of the class and find that the need of explanation is lessened, with the incidental disciplinary gain that a pupil is on better terms with a textbook that does not demand constant intervention of the teacher as interpreter.

As to the important matter of vocabulary, about five hundred words have been selected to be learned outright; these are introduced gradually and emphasized in every possible way; for example, only these words, as far as I observed, are used in English-Latin exercises; and their special distinction is made appa-

rent by printing them in compact, classified form before the general vocabulary. The reading lessons—every fifth lesson in the book—draw on a larger vocabulary. Some of the words included in the list of 500, as *calcar*, *cras*, *heri*, *ros*, might well give way to commoner ones; but in each case one can divine the reason for inclusion and acknowledge its force.

I have noted a number of misprints, only one, however, of any importance: on p. 57, in the paradigm, the accusative plural *-is* seems to be marked short.

SUSAN FOWLER

THE BREARLEY SCHOOL
New York City

The Menexenus of Plato. Edited by J. A. SHAWYER. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906. Pp. xxxi + 46. \$0.50.

The Euthyphro, Apology and Crito. Edited by F. M. STAWELL. [The Temple Greek and Latin Classics.] New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906. Pp. xxiii + 168. \$1 net.

The text of the *Menexenus* is taken from Burnet without change. The introduction, which upholds the authenticity of the dialogue and denies that it is a parody, contains an interesting defense of falsification in history, on the ground that an expression of the spirit and feeling of the author is far more important than the literal facts; discusses in detail the inaccuracies of the *Menexenus*, and ends with a clear and forcible summary of the growth of Greek oratory. The commentary is not so harmonious and satisfactory as the introduction. One or two questions introduced among the notes seem to imply a didactic purpose, but much of the annotation is beyond the grasp of young students. The summaries of history (after Bury) are excellent, but a dozen or more of the lexical notes are quite needless, as they are simply abstracts of articles in L. and S. In 237 C the editor has completely misunderstood *ὑποδεξαμένης*, which is not "received" as a nurse, but in the maternal embrace of the grave. Again, in commenting on 240 C he has put "Hyacinthia," where he should have written "Carneia," and in the note on 240 D (p. 12, last line) he has "subj." instead of "opt." The only actual misprints noted are *Demoniucm* (p. xxxi), *ἐντετήκε* and probably *μόλιβδον* in the note on 245 D; but twice (239 B *ἡμύναντο*, 245 D *Ἑλληνες*) his commentary uses a reading different from the text. Moreover, the quotation from Herodotus illustrating 239 B is awkwardly separated from its reference, and under 240 B the citation "Lysias, p. 82" is an absolute mystery. Similarly under 243 E the reference "Xen. *Hist. Gr.* ii. 68" (elsewhere *Hell.*) is quite impossible. Again (238 C), the parallel between *annonna* and *πολιτεία* is far from obvious, unless it be that the meanings of each word are quite varied.

The volume edited by Stawell is the second in the Temple Series, a well-made book of handy size. A fine gem, presenting a full-length figure of Socrates, forms the frontispiece; the introduction gives a convincing statement of the reasons for Socrates' condemnation, and contains the closing chapters of the

Phaedo. The text is taken from Adam, and the very readable translation on the opposite pages is made by the editor, who succeeds in reproducing the spirit of the Greek without slavish adherence to the verbal form. It would have been well to have prefixed summaries of the *Apology* and *Crito* as well as of the *Euthyphro*, and to have shown more definitely that the real keynote of the *Euthyphro* is the fourth definition (12 E.).

BARKER NEWHALL

KENYON COLLEGE

The Agamemnon of Aeschylus. A Revised Text and a Translation by WILLIAM W. GOODWIN. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1906. Pp. iv + 147. \$0.75.

The most tangible fruit of the recent Harvard presentation of the *Agamemnon* is doubtless Professor Goodwin's revised text and translation of the play published for the classical department of the university.

In the revision of the text Professor Goodwin has adopted the readings of several difficult and disputed passages defended by him in a contribution to the *Transactions of the American Philological Association* for 1877. The translation faces the text, and both the English and the Greek page present an attractive appearance.

The translation has the true Aeschylean ring—lofty, strong, spirited.

Perhaps no Greek tragedy offers so much opportunity for differences of reading and interpretation as this, and critics might find many places in which to dissent from the views of the reviser and translator. But that the handling of the text is conservative, that the interpretation is eminently sane, and that the diction is fitting, was to be expected from the veteran Hellenist who has given us this fresh proof of his unquenched vitality.

Many happy terms in the phrasing might be cited. Such, e.g., are the following:

Vss. 438 ff.: "Ares the broker who deals in human bodies and holds the scales in the contest of the spear."

Vss. 483 ff.: "The female sex ranges too credulous, quick in resources, but by a speedy death perishes glory which is woman-heralded."

In a few instances I should have chosen a different word: for example, *ἄρα* (131) = "jealousy" rather than "wrath;" *πρὸς ἀνδρὸς* (12) in the context = "relating to any other man;" *ἀτμός* (1311) = "breath," "vapor," rather than "blast;" *κύτος* (1228) refers to what we call a "bath-tub" rather than to an "urn." But then translation is so much a matter of feeling, and who can feel just what another feels? In several places where the text is uncertain or corrupt Professor Goodwin attempts no emendation and no translation.

In the Cassandra scene a less judicious hand would have yielded to the temptation to translate the suggested pun in *ἀπὸλλων ἐμὸς* by "my destroyer," or "my Apollyon," as some have it; it is better felt than expressed.

MARTIN L. D'OOGHE

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Select Epigrams of Martial. Edited from the text of PROFESSOR LINDSAY by R. T. BRIDGE and E. D. C. LAKE, Assistant-Masters at Charterhouse. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906. Pp. xxxii + 128. \$0.90.

For many years a good edition of selected epigrams from Martial has been badly needed; but the volume before me will be of little service to American students. It is intended for the use of upper forms in the English public schools; and, inasmuch as the editors are actual teachers at Charterhouse, I am not prepared to question its suitability for that purpose. The text is frankly taken from Professor W. M. Lindsay, one of the few men who have really contributed to the promotion of our knowledge of what Martial wrote. The notes, with equal frankness, are largely anglicized adaptations from Friedländer's admirable edition. The introduction is helpful, and the index reliable as far as tested. For some reason, unexplained and perhaps unexplainable, the selections are limited to the last six books, which certainly do not contain all of Martial's best work. The principle of selection seems to have been to exclude only the impossible epigrams, rather than to include only those worth reading. There are practically no comments on peculiarities of style, although space is taken for a critical apparatus. There is no bibliography. The short abstract at the beginning of the notes on each epigram is not seldom confusing, appearing now as a summary in the present tense, now as a comment on the subject-matter. None of the really difficult grammatical questions are touched, although some of the easiest are carefully explained. It is hardly necessary to say that one could criticize many details; but the editors have proposed a very modest aim, and from their point of view many of my criticisms would doubtless fall beside the mark.

FRED. B. R. HELLEMS

Auswahl aus den griechischen Philosophen. Zweiter Teil: *Auswahl aus Aristoteles und den nachfolgenden Philosophen.* Von DR. OSKAR WEISSENFELS. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1906. Pp. viii + 122; iv + 110.

The selections are well made. They include extracts from the *Ethics*, *Rhetoric*, *Politics*, and *Poetics* of Aristotle; from Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, as representatives of the Stoics; from Epicurus; from the *Characters* of Theophrastus; from Plutarch; and from Lucian,—in the order here given. The portions presented are not too difficult for college freshmen, and the second volume gives the necessary introductory matter and a good commentary. A book of this kind would doubtless be welcomed by some American teachers, but the demand would not justify an English edition.

W. A. HEIDEL